



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

W  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/666,684	09/20/2000	Robert A. Ward	OOP7901US	5477

7590 02/12/2003

Siemens Corporation  
Intellectual Property Department  
186 Wood Avenue South  
Iselin, NJ 08830

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

ADDISON, KAREN B

[REDACTED] ART UNIT

[REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

2834

DATE MAILED: 02/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/666,684	WARD ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Karen B Addison	2834

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 November 2002.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 7,8,14,15,19 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 7,8,14,15,19 and 20 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 23 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a)  The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                    | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)           | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                                   |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

1. Claims 7-8,14-15 and19-20 are allowed
2. Claim 23 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
3. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Prior art fails to shows: a pair of fingers of the plurality of fingers of the coil support finger plates each extends outwardly between an adjacent pair of end portions of the plurality of spaced –apart stator coil slots.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawabata (6072259) in view of Cope (4160926).  
Kawabata disclose a stator comprising: coil finger plate (18) having a base portion(C) which defines a stator coil slot bottom (E) and a distal end portion (d) on at least one finger. Kawabata does not disclose a first wedge being formed in a distal end portion of at least one finger of the coil support finger plate extending between end portions of the

first and second stator coil slots and the second wedge land for the second wedge being formed in the distal end portion of the same at least one finger of the coil support plate.

Cope discloses in fig. 9 a stator core comprising: a first and second slot wedges (96) each overlie a corresponding one end portions of the first finger (A) and second stator coil slots (84); wherein the first and second space - apart wedge lands (86) are formed in the support plate (82). Cope also disclose the first wedge land for the first wedge being formed in a distal end portion of at least one finger of the coil support finger plate extending between end portions of the first and second stator coil slots and a second wedge land for the second wedge being formed in the distal end portion of the same at least one finger coil support plate for the purpose of supporting the coils. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the stator of Kawabata with the slot wedges of Cope for the purpose of protecting the stator coils and securing excellent insulation.

***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments filed 11/25/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's argument that Kabata fails to teach a fingerplate is noted.

However, Kabata clearly shows in fig.1 an endplate having fingers, which constitutes a "finger plate" as stated in the above rejection.

Applicant's argument, that Cope fails to show or teach a finger plate is noted.

However, Cope clearly shows in fig.9 a coil support plate (82) having a first finger (A) wherein, a first and second slot wedges (96) each overlies a corresponding one-end portion of the finger (A) and stator slot coils.

7. In response to the applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., step down region) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

8. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

### ***Conclusion***

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karen B Addison whose telephone number is 703-306-5855. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 to 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nestor Ramirez can be reached on 703-308-1317. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-3431 for regular communications and 703-305-3431 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

KBA  
February 7, 2003

*Thomas M. Dougherty*  
TELECOM DOCUMENTATION  
PROMOTIONAL MATERIALS  
GROUP 2100  
2800